DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENTY SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3828 NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT DATE 2006

TO : [ ].

FROM : Aleks Kurgvel.

Date: 3 Aug 1964.

SUBJECT: Backpayment of Advance taken in connection with TDY, Feb.-June 1964.

- 2. A check on this amount, drawn against my wife's and mine common account at the First National City Bank, New York, is here attached.
- 3. I was given no explanation as to the computation of this back payment. It seems to me that this might have been caused by some reduction in per diem rate for the fourth month of the duration of the TDY, of which possibility I herd after I received the instruction about the backpaiment.

In connection with this, will you, please, give your kind consideration to the following thoughts.

- a) The duration of my TDY was foreseen for three months. I was informed in advance that it could be shortened if the Station would have to close the operation in which I was to participate. Also, I was asked not to refuse to remain for a <u>few days longer</u> than the three months if the Station would ask me for that. During these talks at the time when I received the first advance I asked for information about the perdiem rate. I was told that this is \$19.00. There was nothing said about any change of rate after the three original months.
- b) I have not seen the ordinance dealing with the shortening of per diem rates on longer than three-month TDY. However, I understand the reasonability of such a provision in cases when the person can plan his life during the TDY accordingly, when he knows that he will have to stay for a reasonably long period of time over three months and on drastically shortened per diem rates.
- c) I did not know this when planning my life on TDY because there was talk of just a few days of possible extention over 3 months.
- d) Nor could the Station provide me with official accommodation where the rent would have diminished automatically with the reduction of the per diem rate. As a matter of fact, I could have received rather primitive official accommodation for the last two weeks of my stay on TDY, but I asked my immediate supervisor at the Station not to force me into it. The He agreed with me that the 40% deduction of my \$19.00 per diem,= \$ 7.60 per day, would have

been toohigh for the available room and the "discomfort" coupled with the use of it as compared with the rent I paid in a guesthouse for a reasonably comfortable accommodation.

- e) When I asked the Station for an additional advance of \$ 600.00

  I went out from the calculation of \$ 19.00 per diem pay and an approximately one month stay over the original three months, as was envisased by the Station at this time after different earlier shorter calculations of my stay. The Station agreed with my calculation and gave me the advance.
- f) When a delay in the planned development of my original work became evident, the Station ordered me to interrupt my original work and to replace another person on a similar work during his 2-weeks leave of absence. This was a reasonable order in view of the uncontrollable technical delays.
- g) When, at last, the new LP was functioning, and the person who had to replace me had arrived, I was asked to stay for one more week so that we could work together and get the most of the neccessary work done.
- h) All this shows that not only I, but also the Station and my replacement, who came from Washington with new instructions, did not realise that my per diem rate for this piecemeal extention of my stay was so drastically cut.
- i) In my estimates and planning this amounts not only to the ordered backpayment of \$255.92, but to \$ 11.00 for each day I remained at the Station over the 90-day limit of the originally planned length of the TDY.
- 4. Will you, please, kindly help to adjust the official accounting of my per diem pay for this TDY, if you agree with my reasoning.

Stersvingen

ENCLOSURE: Check # 19, on the amount of \$255.92---

...